



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/666,583	09/21/2000	William C. Dalrymple	7000-027	7538

27820 7590 02/12/2004

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

P.O. BOX 1287

CARY, NC 27512

EXAMINER

DUONG, OANH L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

3

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/666,583

Applicant(s)

DALRYMPLE ET AL.

Examiner

Oanh L. Duong

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The feature "**instructions to interact with the associated operating system** to affect an applications protocol interface server" was not supported in the specification.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

2. Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-15 and 18-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jacobs et al. (Jacobs)

Regarding claim 1, Jacobs discloses a computer readable media containing software for facilitating synchronization of web browsers (fig. 2, abstract), said software instruction for computer to automatically identify location indicia for a first web page loaded by an associated browser (page 7 lines 14-16) and send (communication) the location indicia for the first web page over a network for loading on a remote browser running on a remote computer (page 4 section 3.1 and page 7 lines 9-13).

Regarding claim 2, Jacobs discloses receive location indicia for a second web page loaded by the mote browser running on the remote computer; and effect loading of the second web page on the associated browser based on the location indicia for the second web page (page 7 lines 14-16).

Regarding claim 3, Jacobs discloses query a user of the associated browser whether to send the location indicia for the first web page for loading on the remote browser; receive a response to the query; and if the response is affirmative, send the location indicia for the first web page for loading on the remote browser (page 7 lines 14-16).

Regarding claim 4, Jacobs discloses upon receiving the location indicia for the second web page, query a user of the associated browser whether to load the second web page; receive a response to the query; and if the response is affirmative, effect loading of the second web page on the associated browser (page 7 section 3.2.5).

Regarding claim 5, Jacob discloses instructions to send the location indicia for the first web page over the network for loading on a plurality of remote browsers (page 7 lines 32-37).

Regarding claim 6, Jacobs discloses to configure the associated browser to provide the location indicia for the first web page upon loading the first web page (page 7 lines 14-16).

Regarding claim 7, Jacobs discloses to establish a communication session with the remote computer over the network to enable sending the location indicia for the first web page for loading on the remote browser page 6 lines 2-3).

Regarding claim 8, Jacob discloses to implement the associated browser wherein the associated is configured for web browser synchronization (page 5 section 3.1.3).

Regarding claim 9, Jacobs discloses a computer readable media containing software for implementing a web browser interface device facilitating synchronization of web browsers, said software (fig. 2, abstract) said software comprising instructions for computer to receiving from an associated browser location indicia for a first web page loaded by the associated browser (page 5 section 3.1.3 and page 7 lines 14-16); sending the location indicia for the first web page over a network for loading on a remote browser running on a remote computer (page 5 section 3.1.3); receive location indicia for a second web page loaded by the remote browser running on the remote computer (page 5 section 3.1.3 and page 7 lines 14-16); and instruct the associated browser to load the second web page on the associated browser based on the location indicia for the second web page (page 5 section 3.1.3 and page 7 lines 14-16).

Regarding claim 10, Jacobs discloses configure the associated browser to provide location indicia for a web page for sending to the remote browser, the web page

Art Unit: 2155

initially selected by a user of the associated browser and loaded by the associated browser (page 5 section 3.1.3 and page 6 section 3.2.3); configure the associated browser to receive and load the web page initially selected by a user of the remote browser upon receiving the location indicia for the web page initially selected by the user of the remote browser, wherein the first web page is a web page initially selected by a user of the associated browser and the second web page is a web page initially selected by a user of the remote browser (page 5 section 3.1.3 and page 7 lines 14-16).

Regarding claim 11, Jacobs teaches establish a communication session with the remote computer over the network to enable sending the location indicia for the first web page for loading on the remote browser and receiving location indicia for the second web page (page 5 section 3.1.3)

Regarding claim 12, Jacobs discloses communication session is established with a web interface device running in association with the remote browser on the remote computer (page 4 section 3.1).

Regarding claim 13, Jacobs discloses communication session is established with the remote browser on the remote computer (fig. 2 section 3.1).

Regarding claim 14, Jacobs discloses interaction with the associated browser is conducted via an application protocol interface (Co Web client) (fig. 2).

Regarding claim 15, Jacobs discloses an application protocol interface server (fig. 2).

Regarding claim 18, the same rationale as applied to claim 9.

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claim 22, a system of claim 22 has a corresponding computer readable media of claim 18; therefore, claim 22 is rejected under the same rationale as applied to claim 18.

Regarding claims 19 and 23, the same rationale as applied to claim 3.

Regarding claim 20, the same rationale as applied to claim 4.

Regarding claim 21, the same rationale as applied to claim 5.

Regarding claim 24, claim 23 performs the same function as claim 24 in a reverse order; therefore, the claim 24 is rejected under the same rationale as applied to claim 24.

Regarding claim 25, a system of claim 25 has a corresponding computer readable media of claim 9; therefore, claim 25 is rejected under the same rationale as applied to claim 9.

Regarding claim 26, the same rationale as applied to claim 19.

Regarding claim 27, the same rationale as applied to claim 4.

Regarding claim 28, a method of claim 28 has a corresponding system of claim 25; therefore, claim 28 is rejected under the same rationale as applied to claim 25.

Regarding claim 29, the same rationale as applied to claim 26.

Regarding claim 30, the same rationale as applied to claim 27.

Regarding claim 31, the same rationale as applied to claim 5.

Regarding claim 32, the same rationale as applied to claim 7.

Regarding claim 33, a method of claim 33 has a corresponding system of claim 9; therefore, claim 33 is rejected under the same rationale as applied to claim 9.

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claim 34, the same rationale as applied to claim 10.

Regarding claim 35, the same rationale as applied to claim 33.

Regarding claim 36, a system of claim 36 has a corresponding method of claim 35, therefore, the same rationale as applied to claim 35.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs in view of Burg et al. (Burg) (2003/0061354 A1).

Regarding claim 16, Jacobs does not explicitly disclose incorporate URL in invite message using SIP as claimed. However, Burg, in the same of endeavor, discloses incorporate the received location indicia for the first web page in an invite message wherein the instructions to send the location indicia for the first web page over the network send the invite message to the remote computer using session initiation protocol (page 5 paragraphs 0100-0104). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Jacobs with the teachings of Burg because it was conventionally employed in the art to allow a browsing session to be created, modified and terminated with multiple participants.



Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oanh L. Duong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

O.D  
February 7, 2004